1	JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP, Attorney General				
2	of the State of California MICHAEL R. GRANEN,				
3	Deputy Attorney General 3580 Wilshire Blvd.				
4	Los Angeles, CA 90010 Telephone: (213) 736-2068				
5	Attorneys for Complainant				
6					
7					
8	BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY				
9	BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE				
10	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
11					
12	In the Matter of the Petition) NO. D-3485 Against:				
13	Against.				
14	ROGER N. GOODLIN, M.D.) DEFAULT DECISION 1024 S. Walnut Street)				
15	San Gabriel, CA 91776				
16	Physician's and Surgeon's) Certificate No. A032752,)				
17	Respondent.)				
18					
19	The Board of Medical Quality Assurance, Department of				
20	Consumer Affairs, State of California (hereinafter "board")				
21	makes the following Findings of Fact, Determination of Issues				
22	and Order:				
23	FINDINGS OF FACT				
24	1. On or about April 11, 1986, Roger N. Goodlin, M.D.				

statement to respondent, request for discovery, form notice of

(hereinafter "respondent"), was served with the petition to

revoke probation and vacate stay of license revocation,

25

26

defense, and copies of Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.5, and 11507.7 as provided for by sections 11503 and 11505 of the Government Code and has failed to file a notice of defense within the time allowed by section 11506 of said code.

- 2. On or about August 7, 1978, the board issued to respondent physician's and surgeon's certificate A032752 and said certificate was at all times in full force and effect except as described below.
- 3. Respondent is required to report immediately to the board each and every change in address, giving both the old and new address, pursuant to section 2021, subdivision (b) of the code and section 1303 of title 16 of the California Administrative Code. Respondent was served at his address of record with the board and all other current addresses known to the board. Return receipt cards for certified mail service upon respondent are on file with the board.
- 4. The board finds that the facts and allegatons set forth in the petition to revoke probation and to vacate stay of license revocation are true. Said petition to revoke probation and vacate stay of license revocation is on file with the board and the facts and allegations contained therein are incorporated herein by reference as if fully set forth herein. A copy of said petition to revoke probation and vacate stay of license revocation is attached hereto.

- 5. Jurisdiction of the board is properly established by service on respondent at his address of record with the board in accordance with Government Code sections 11503 and 11505, subdivision (c) and section 1303 of title 16 of the California Administrative Code.
- 6. Respondent has not filed a notice of defense and therefore has waived the right to a hearing to contest the petition to revoke probation and vacate stay of license revocation as provided for by Government Code section 11506.
- 7. The board will take action on the petition to revoke probation and vacate stay of license revocation without a hearing as provided for by section 11505, subdivision (a), and section 11520 of the Government Code.
- 8. The board takes official notice that Kenneth J. Wagstaff, complainant herein, is the Executive Director of the board and filed the petition to revoke probation and vacate stay of license revocation in his official capacity.
- 9. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation, the stay of license revocation is subject to vacation and respondent's physician's and surgeon's certificate is subject to revocation for the following reasons:
 - A. Pursuant to section 2004 of the Business and Professions Code (hereinafter the "Code"), the Division of Medical Quality of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance is charged with the responsibility of enforcing discipline provisions of the California Medical Practice Act.

- B. Pursuant to section 2234 of the Code, the Division of Medical Quality shall take action against any holder of a physician's and surgeon's certificate licensee who is guilty of unprofessional conduct.
- C. Section 2234, subdivision (e) of the Code provides that unprofessional conduct includes the commission of any act involving dishonesty, corruption which is substantilaly related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a physician or surgeon.
- D. Section 2236, subdivision (a), (b) and (c) of the Code provides as follows:
- "(a) The conviction of any offense, substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon constitutes unprofessional conduct within the meaning of this chapter. The record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence only of the fact that the conviction occurred.
- "(b) The division may inquire into the circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime in order to fix the degree of discipline or to determine if such conviction is of an offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon. A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere made to a charge substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this section.

"(c) Discipline may be ordered in accordance with section 2227, . . . when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment has been affirmed on appeal or when an order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under the provisions of section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing such person to withdraw his plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or setting aside the verdict of guilty or dismissing the accusation, information or indictment."

E. Section 490 of Code provides that a board within the Department of Consumer Affairs may suspend or revoke a license on the ground that a licensee has been convicted of a crime, if the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the license was issued.

Discipline Previously Imposed

G. On January 17, 1983, the division in Case
No. D-2765, revoked respondent's certificate, stayed the
revocation and placed respondent on probation for a period
of five years from the effective date of the decision. A
true copy of the decision is attached hereto as Appendix A
(hereinafter Division's Decision) and incorporated herein.
The Division's Decision became final and probation
commenced on February 16, 1983. The Division's Decision
adopts and incorporates a stipulation signed by respondent
which sets forth the facts (admitted by respondent)
supporting discipline, that cause for discipline exists,

the discipline imposed and the conditions of probation.

The Division's Decision reads in pertinent part as follows:

"4. Respondent admits as true the facts found by the division in its administrative decision as follows:

"A. On or about February 18, 1981, in the Municipal Court of the Santa Monica Judicial District, County of Los Angeles, State of California, in a case entitled, "People v. Goodlin," case number D58606, respondent plead guilty to and was convicted of violating section 647, subdivision (f) of the Penal Code (public intoxication). During the arrest on or about December 9, 1980, which led to the aforenoted conviction, respondent was found to be illegally in possession of Quaalude."

"B. On or about August 27, 1980, in the Municipal Court of the Los Angeles Judicial District, County of Los Angeles, in a case entitled, "People v. Goodlin," case number V094823, respondent plead guilty to and was convicted of violating section 21658, subdivision (a), of the Vehicle Code (failure to drive within on lane) and section 22348, subdivision (a) of the Vehicle Code (speeding). Respondent was intoxicated at the time in question.

"C. On or about August 4, 1980, in the Municipal Court of Long Beach Judicial District, County of Los Angeles, State of California, in a case entitled, "People v. David Sherwood Dunard," the

latter being a name used by respondent, case number M162345, respondent pled guilty to and was convicted of violating section 415.1 of the Penal Code (disturbing the peace). Respondent was intoxicated at the time in question.

"5. Based on the foregoing facts and admissions, cause for disciplinary action exists against respondent pursuant to section 2361 of the Business and Professions Code (now section 2234), in that respondent was guilty of unprofessional conduct within the meaning of section 2390 of the Business and Professions Code (now section 2239), in that respondent used alcoholic beverages to the extent or in such a manner as to be dangerous to himself or another or to the public and respondent was convicted of more than one misdemeanor involving the use of alcoholic beverages or controlled substances. Further cause for disciplinary action exists against respondent pursuant to section 2361 of the Business and Professions Code (now section 2234), in that respondent was engaged in unprofessional conduct within the meaning of section 2391.5 of the Business and Professions Code (now section 2238), in having violated a law regulating dangerous drugs or controlled substances.

2627

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

/

7.

"WHEREFORE, it is stipulated and agreed that the division shall set aside its decision of revocation effective on August 13, 1982, and issue the following decision:

"Physician's and surgeon's certificate number A 32752 heretofore issued to respondent Roger Neal Goodlin, M.D., is hereby revoked; however, said revocation is stayed and respondent is placed on probation for five (5) years upon the following terms and conditions:

"1. Actual Suspension

"As part of probation, respondent is suspended from the practice of medicine for 120 days beginning November 1, 1982.

"2. <u>Partial Restriction Regarding Controlled</u> <u>Substance</u>

"Respondent shall not prescribe, administer, dispense, order, or possess any schedule II controlled substances as defined by the California Uniform Controlled substances Act.

"A. Respondent shall immediately surrender respondent's current DEA permit to the Drug Enforcement Administration for cancellation and reapply for a new DEA permit limited to those schedules authorized by this order.

/

"B. The above prohibition against personal use or posession of controlled subtances or dangerous drugs does not apply to medication lawfully prescribed to respondent for a bona fide illness or condition by another practitioner.

"3. Abstention

"Respondent shall abstain completely from the use of alcoholic beverages. Respondent shall immediately submit to biological fluid testing, at respondent's cost, upon the request of the division or its designee.

"4. Psychiatric Evaluation

"Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, and on a periodic basis thereafter as may be required by the division or its designee, respondent shall undergo a psychiatric evaluation by a division appointed psychiatrist who shall furnish a psychiatric report to the division or its designee.

"If respondent is required by the division or its designee to undergo psychiatric treatment, respondent shall within 30 days of the requirement notice submit to the division for its prior approval the name and qualifications of a psychiatrist of respondent's choice. Upon approval of the treating psychiatrist, respondent shall undergo and continue psychiatric treatment until further notice from the division.

Respondent shall have the treating psychiatrist submit quarterly status reports to the division.

"5. Alcohol Rehabilitation Program

"Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall submit to the division for its prior approval an alcohol rehabilitation program in which respondent shall participate at least weekly for at least 50 weeks of the calendar year for the duration of probation. In the quarterly reports to the division, respondent shall provide documentary evidence of continuing participation in this program.

"6. Education Course

"The division shall determine how many, if any additional continuing education hours respondent shall fulfill. If such additional hours are so required as part of the conditions of probation, within 90 days of the effective date of this decision, and on an annual basis thereafter, respondent shall submit to the division for its prior approval an educational program or course related to general medicine or a field of specialization respondent shall engage in for each year of probation. This program shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education requirements for re-licensure. Following the completion of each course, the division or its designee may administer an examination to test respondent's knowledge of the course.

,

10.

"7. Obey All Laws

"Respondent shall obey all federal, state and local laws, and all rules governing the practice of medicine in California.

"8. Quarterly Reports

"Respondent shall submit quarterly declarations under penalty of perjury on forms provided by the division, stating whether there has been compliance with all the conditions of probation.

"9. Surveillance Program

"Respondent shall comply with the division's probation surveillance program.

"10. Interview With Medical Consultant

"Respondent shall appear in person for interviews with the division's medical consultant upon request at various intervals and with reasonable notice.

"11. Tolling for Out-of-State Practice or Residence

"In the event respondent should leave California to reside or to practice outside the state, respondent must notify the division in writing of the dates of departure and return. Periods of residency or practice outside California will not apply to the reduction of his probationary period.

"12. Completion of Probation

"Upon successful completion of probation, respondent's certificate will be fully restored.

"13. Violation of Probation

"If respondent violates probation in any respect, the division, after giving respondent notice an the opportunity to be heard, may revoke probation and carry out the disciplinary order that was stayed. If an accusation or petition to revoke probation is filed against respondent during probation, the division shall have continuing jurisdiction until the matter is final, and the period of probation shall be extended until the matter is final.

* * * * * *

"DECISION AND ORDER

"The prior decision revoking respondent's license is hereby set aside. The above stipulation is adopted as the decision of the Division of Medical Quality of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance.

"Further, respondent is ordered to fulfill 50 hours of continuing education per year in addition to the continuing education requirements for re-licensure, pursuant to probation condition number 7 of the above stipulation."

- G. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he has failed to comply with the conditions of his probation. The circumstances are as follows:
 - (1) Respondent has attended alcohol rehabilitation meetings required by Condition 5 of his probation under the influence of alcohol in violation

of Condition 3 of his probation.

- (2) Respondent has not attended weekly alcohol rehabilitation meetings as required by Condition 5 of his probation.
- (3) Respondent has failed to submit quarterly reports of compliance since August 1, 1984, in violation of Condition 8 of his probation.
- (4) Respondent has not made himself available for biological fluid specimen tests in violation of Condition 3 of his probation.
- (5) Respondent has not informed the Board of changes in his address and has failed to respond to numerous attempts by the division to contact him in violation of Conditions 2, 7 and 9 of his probation and Business and Professions Code section 2021, subdivision (b), which requires licentiates to immediately report changes of address to the board.
- (6) Respondent has failed to attend mandatory appointments with the probation surveillance officer to discuss violations of his probation in violation of Condition 9 of the respondent's probation that he comply with the Division's surveillance program.
- 10. Based on the foregoing, the board finds that respondent has violated the terms of his probation, that respondent's probation should be revoked, that the order staying revocation of his physician's and surgeon's certificate should be vacated, and that his physician's and surgeon's

certificate should be revoked.

WHEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 1. The petition to revoke probation and vacate stay of license revocation is granted;
- 2. The portion of the order of January 17, 1983, in Division Case No. D-2765 staying revocation of respondent's physician's and surgeon's certificate is vacated and respondent's physician's and surgeon's certificate No. A032752 is hereby revoked; and
- 3. Respondent shall not be deprived of making any further showing by way of mitigation; however, any showing must be made in writing to the Board of Medical Quality Assurance at 1430 Howe Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95825, prior to the effective date of this decision.

BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSUARANCE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Dated: December 30, 1986.

JOHN W. SIMMONS Secretary-Treasurer

THIS DECISION SHALL BECOME EFFECTIVE: January 29., 1987

	•			
1	JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP, Attorney General of the State of California			
2	MICHAEL R. GRANEN,			
3	Deputy Attorney General 3580 Wilshire Boulevard			
4	Los Angeles, CA 90010 Telephone: (213) 736-2068			
5	Attorneys for Complainant			
6				
7				
8	BEFORE THE			
9	DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE			
10	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
11				
12	In the Matter of the Petition) NO. D-3485			
13	Against:)			
14	ROGER N. GOODLIN, M.D.) PETITION TO REVOKE 1024 S. Walnut Street) PROBATION AND VACATE			
15	San Gabriel, CA 91776) STAY OF LICENSE			
16	Physician's and Surgeon's)			
17	Certificate No. A032752)			
18	Petitioner.)			
19	Kenneth J. Wagstaff, the complainant herein, alleges			
20	as follows:			
21	1. He is the Executive Director of the Board of			
22	Medical Quality Assurance (hereinafter "board") of the State of			
23	California and makes and files this petition to revoke			
24	probation and vacate stay of license revocation in his official			
25	capacity.			
26	2. On or about August 7, 1978, the board issued to			
27	Roger N. Goodlin, M.D. (hereinafter "respondent"), physician's			
	1.			

1945H

1

3

5 6

8

9

7

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

and surgeon's certificate A032752. Said certificate was at all times mentioned herein in full force and effect except as described in paragraph 8.

JURISDICTION

- 3. Pursuant to section 2004 of the Business and Professions Code (hereinafter, the "Code"), the Division of Medical Quality of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance is charged with the responsibility of enforcing the disciplinary provisions of the California Medical Practice Act.
- 4. Pursuant to section 2234 of the Code, the Division of Medical Quality shall take action against any holder of a physician's and surgeon's certificate licensee who is guilty of unprofessional conduct.
- Section 2234, subdivision (e) of the Code, provides that unprofessional conduct includes the commission of any act involving dishonesty or corruption which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon.
- Section 2236, subdivisions (a), (b) and (c) of the Code, provides as follows:
 - The conviction of any offense, substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon constitutes unprofessional conduct within the meaning of this chapter. The record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence only of the fact that the conviction occurred.

2.

"(b) The division may inquire into the circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime in order to fix the degree of discipline or to determine if such conviction is of an offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon. A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere made to a charge substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this section.

"(c) Discipline may be ordered in accordance with section 2227, . . . when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment has been affirmed on appeal or when an order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under the provisions of section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing such person to withdraw his plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or setting aside the verdict of guilty, or dismissing the accusation, information or indictment."

7. Section 490 of Code provides that a board within the Department of Consumer Affairs may suspend or revoke a license on the ground that a licensee has been convicted of a crime, if the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the license was issued.

/

3.

No. D-2765, revoked respondent's certificate, stayed the

copy of the decision is attached hereto as Appendix A

revocation and placed respondent on probation for a period of

five years from the effective date of the decision. A true

On January 17, 1983, the division in Case

The

1 2 3

8.

4 5 6

7

8

9 10 11

14

12

13

16

15

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

(hereinafter Division's Decision) and incorporated herein. Division's Decision became final and probation commenced on February 16, 1983. The Division's Decision adopts and incorporates a stipulation signed by respondent which sets forth the facts (admitted by respondent) supporting discipline, that cause for discipline exists, the discipline imposed and the conditions of probation. The Division's Decision reads in pertinent part as follows:

Respondent admits as true the facts found by the division in its administrative decision as follows:

On or about February 18, 1981, in the Municipal Court of the Santa Monica Judicial District, County of Los Angeles, State of California, in a case entitled, "People v. Goodlin," case number D58606, respondent plead guilty to and was convicted of violating section 647, subdivision (f) of the Penal Code (public intoxication). During the arrest on or about December 9, 1980, which led to the aforenoted conviction, respondent was found to be illegally in possession of Quaalude."

1945H

"B. On or about August 27, 1980, in the

Municipal Court of the Los Angeles Judicial District,

County of Los Angeles, in a case entitled, "People v.

Goodlin," case number V094823, respondent plead guilty to

and was convicted of violating section 21658, subdivision

(a), of the Vehicle Code (failure to drive within on lane)

and section 22348, subdivision (a) of the Vehicle Code

(speeding). Respondent was intoxicated at the time in

question.

"C. On or about August 4, 1980, in the
Municipal Court of Long Beach Judicial District, County of
Los Angeles, State of California, in a case entitled,

"People v. David Sherwood Dunard," the latter being a name
used by respondent, case number M162345, respondent pled
guilty to and was convicted of violating section 415.1 of
the Penal Code (disturbing the peace). Respondent was
intoxicated at the time in question.

*5. Based on the foregoing facts and admissions, cause for disciplinary action exists against respondent pursuant to section 2361 of the Business and Professions Code (now section 2234), in that respondent was guilty of unprofessional conduct within the meaning of section 2390 of the Business and Professions Code (now section 2239), in that respondent used alcoholic beverages to the extent or in such a manner as to be dangerous to himself or another or to the public and respondent was convicted of more than one misdemeanor involving the use of alcoholic beverages or

controlled substances. Further cause for disciplinary action exists against respondent pursuant to section 2361 of the Business and Professions Code (now section 2234), in that respondent was engaged in unprofessional conduct within the meaning of section 2391.5 of the Business and Professions Code (now section 2238), in having violated a law regulating dangerous drugs or controlled substances.

"WHEREFORE, it is stipulated and agreed that the division shall set aside its decision of revocation effective on August 13, 1982, and issue the following decision:

"Physician's and surgeon's certificate number A 32752 heretofore issued to respondent Roger Neal Goodlin, M.D., is hereby revoked; however, said revocation is stayed and respondent is placed on probation for five (5) years upon the following terms and conditions:

"1. Actual Suspension

"As part of probation, respondent is suspended from the practice of medicine for 120 days beginning November 1, 1982.

"2. Partial Restriction Regarding Controlled Substance

"Respondent shall not prescribe, administer, dispense, order, or possess any schedule II controlled substances as defined by the California Uniform Controlled substances Act.

"A. Respondent shall immediately surrender respondent's current DEA permit to the Drug Enforcement Administration for cancellation and reapply for a new DEA permit limited to those schedules authorized by this order.

"B. The above prohibition against personal use or posession of controlled subtances or dangerous drugs does not apply to medication lawfully prescribed to respondent for a bona fide illness or condition by another practitioner.

"3. Abstention

"Respondent shall abstain completely from the use of alcoholic beverages. Respondent shall immediately submit to biological fluid testing, at respondent's cost, upon the request of the division or its designee.

"4. Psychiatric Evaluation

"Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, and on a periodic basis thereafter as may be required by the division or its designee, respondent shall undergo a psychiatric evaluation by a division appointed psychiatrist who shall furnish a psychiatric report to the division or its designee.

"If respondent is required by the division or its designee to undergo psychiatric treatment, respondent shall within 30 days of the requirement notice submit to the division for its prior approval the name and qualifications of a psychiatrist of respondent's choice. Upon approval of the treating psychiatrist, respondent shall undergo and continue psychiatric treatment until further notice from the division. Respondent shall have the treating psychiatrist submit quarterly status reports to the division.

"5. Alcohol Rehabilitation Program

"Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall submit to the division for its prior approval an alcohol rehabilitation program in which respondent shall participate at least weekly for at least 50 weeks of the calendar year for the duration of probation. In the quarterly reports to the division, respondent shall provide documentary evidence of continuing participation in this program.

"6. Education Course

"The division shall determine how many, if any additional continuing education hours respondent shall fulfill. If such additional hours are so required as part of the conditions of probation, within 90 days of the effective date of this decision, and on an annual basis thereafter, respondent shall submit to the division for its prior approval an educational program or course related to general medicine or a field of specialization respondent shall engage in for each year of probation. This program shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education requirements for re-licensure. Following the completion of each course, the division or its designee may administer an examination to test respondent's knowledge of the course.

"7. Obey All Laws

"Respondent shall obey all federal, state and local laws, and all rules governing the practice of medicine in California.

"8. Quarterly Reports

"Respondent shall submit quarterly declarations under penalty of perjury on forms provided by the division, stating whether there has been compliance with all the conditions of probation.

"9. Surveillance Program

"Respondent shall comply with the division's probation surveillance program.

"10. Interview With Medical Consultant

"Respondent shall appear in person for interviews with the division's medical consultant upon request at various intervals and with reasonable notice.

"ll. Tolling for Out-of-State Practice or Residence

"In the event respondent should leave California to reside or to practice outside the state, respondent must notify the division in writing of the dates of departure and return. Periods of residency or practice outside California will not apply to the reduction of his probationary period.

"12. Completion of Probation

"Upon successful completion of probation, respondent's certificate will be fully restored.

"13. Violation of Probation

"If respondent violates probation in any respect, the division, after giving respondent notice an the opportunity to be heard, may revoke probation and carry out the disciplinary order that was stayed. If an accusation or

petition to revoke probation is filed against respondent during probation, the division shall have continuing jurisdiction until the matter is final, and the period of probation shall be extended until the matter is final.

* * * * * *

"DECISION AND ORDER

"The prior decision revoking respondent's license is hereby set aside. The above stipulation is adopted as the decision of the Division of Medical Quality of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance.

"Further, respondent is ordered to fulfill 50 hours of continuing education per year in addition to the continuing education requirements for re-licensure, pursuant to probation condition number 7 of the above stipulation."

VIOLATIONS

- 9. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he has failed to comply with the conditions of his probation. The circumstances are as follows:
 - A. Respondent has attended alcohol rehabilitation meetings required by Condition 5 of his probation under the influence of alcohol in violation of Condition 3 of his probation.
 - B. Respondent has not attended weekly alcohol rehabilitation meetings as required by Condition 5 of his probation.
 - C. Respondent has failed to submit quarterly reports of compliance since August 1, 1984, in violation of

Condition 8 of his probation.

- D. Respondent has not made himself available for biological fluid specimen tests in violation of Condition 3 of his probation.
- E. Respondent has not informed the Board of changes in his address and has failed to respond to numerous attempts by the division to contact him in violation of Conditions 2, 7 and 9 of his probation and Business and Professions Code section 2021, subdivision (b), which requires licentiates to immediately report changes of address to the board.
- F. Respondent has failed to attend mandatory appointments with the probation surveillance officer to discuss violations of his probation in violation of Condition 9 of the respondent's probation that he comply with the Division's surveillance program.

REVOCATION OF PROBATION AND VACATING ORDER STAYING REVOCATION OF LICENSE

10. Based on the foregoing violations of probation and pursuant to code section 2227 and probation Condition 13, respondent's probation is subject to revocation, the stay of revocation of respondent's certificate may be vacated and his certificate ordered revoked.

/ / /

11.

1945H

WHEREFORE, complainant prays that the division conduct a hearing on the matters alleged herein and following said hearing and pursuant to section 2227 of the code and probation probation Condition 13, issue its decision:

- 1. Finding that Roger N. Goodlin, M.D. has violated the terms of his probation;
- 2. Setting aside the stay order and impose revocation of Dr. Goodlin's certificate;
- 3. Take such other and further action as it deems proper.

Dated: April 11, 1986 .

KENNETH U. WAGSTAFF

Executive Director

Board of Medical Quality Assurance

Complainant

1945H

12.

GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, Attorney General NANCY K. CHIU, Deputy Attorney General 3580 Wilshire Boulevard 3 Los Angeles, California 90010 Telephone: (213) 736-2000 4 Attorneys for Complainant 5 6 7 8 BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY 9 BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS 10 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 11 In the Matter of the Accusation D-2765 No. Against: 12 STIPULATION, DECISION ROGER NEAL GOODLIN, M.D. AND ORDER 13 1024 S. Walnut Street San Gabriel, CA 91776 14 Physician's and Surgeon's 15 Certificate No. A-32752, 16 Respondent. 17 18 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED as true by and 19 between Bennet Olan, Esquire, as attorney for respondent 20 Roger Neal Goodlin, M.D., and Nancy K. Chiu, deputy attorney 21 general, as attorney for complainant, the following: 22 On or about June 10, 1981, an accusation in case 23 number D-2765 was filed against respondent. On or about 24 July 8, 1981, a first amended accusation was filed against 25 respondent. Copies of said pleadings are attached hereto as

1.

annex 1. Said pleadings were duly served on respondent.

1 Respondent then filed a timely notice of defense. Notice of 2 hearing was sent to respondent at his address of record filed 3 with the Board of Medical Quality Assurance.

2. On May 24, 1982, a default administrative hearing was held at the Office of Administrative Hearings in Los Angeles, 6 California. The Division of Medical Quality of the Board of 7 Medical Quality Assurance (hereinafter the "division") adopted a 8 proposed decision to revoke respondent's license to practice 9 medicine. Said decision was effective on August 13, 1982.

10

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- On or about September 7, 1982, respondent filed a 11 petition for a writ of mandate with the Superior Court of the 12 County of Los Angeles in a case entitled "Roger Neal Goodlin v. 13 Division of Medical Quality, Board of Medical Quality Assurance," 14 case number C 424429. On October 6, 1982, an alternative writ 15 was issued by said court ordering the division to set aside its 16 decision or in the alternative to show cause on December 16, 1982, 17 why it should not.
- Respondent admits as true the facts found by the 4. 19 division in its administrative decision as follows:
 - On or about February 18, 1981, in the Municipal Court of the Santa Monica Judicial District, County of Los Angeles, State of California, in a case entitled, "People vs. Goodlin," case number D58606, respondent pled guilty to and was convicted of violating section 647, subdivision (f), of the Penal Code (public intoxication). During the arrest on or about December 9, 1980, which led to the aforenoted

conviction, respondent was found to be illegally in possession of Quaalude.

B. On or about August 27, 1980, in the Municipal Court of the Los Angeles Judicial District, County of Los Angeles, in a case entitled, "People vs. Goodlin," case number V094823, respondent pled guilty to and was convicted of violating section 21658, subdivision (a), of the Vehicle Code (failure to drive within on lane) and section 22348, subdivision (a), of the Vehicle Code (speeding). Respondent was intoxicated at the time in question.

- C. On or about August 4, 1980, in the Municipal Court of Long Beach Judicial District, County of Los Angeles, State of California, in a case entitled, People vs. David Sherwood Dunard," the latter being a name used by respondent, case number M162345, respondent pled guilty to and was convicted of violating section 415.1 of the Penal Code (disturbing the peace). Respondent was intoxicated at the time in question.
- 5. Based on the foregoing facts and admissions, cause for disciplinary action exists against respondent pursuant to section 2361 of the Business and Professions Code (now section 2234), in that respondent was guilty of unprofessional conduct within the meaning of section 2390 of the Business and Professions Code (now section 2239), in that respondent used alcoholic beverages to the extent or in such a manner as to be

1 dangerous to himself or another or to the public, and respondent was convicted of more than one misdemeanor involving the use of 3 alcoholic beverages or controlled substances. Further cause for disciplinary action exists against respondent pursuant to section 2361 of the business and Professions Code (now section 2234), in that respondent was engaged in unprofessional conduct within the meaning of section 2391.5 of the Business and Professions Code (now section 2238), in having violated a law regulating dangerous 9 drugs or controlled substances.

WHEREFORE, it is stipulated and agreed that the 11 division shall set aside its decision of revocation effective on 12 August 13, 1982, and issue the following decision:

Physician's and surgeon's certificate number A 32752 14 | heretofore issued to respondent Roger Neal Goodlin, M.D., is 15 hereby revoked; however, said revocation is stayed and respondent $16\parallel$ is placed on probation for five (5) years upon the following terms and conditions:

Actual Suspension

10

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

As part of probation, respondent is suspended from the practice of medicine for 120 days beginning November 1, 1982.

Partial Restriction Regarding Controlled Substance

Respondent shall not prescribe, administer, dispense, order, or possess any schedule II controlled substances as defined by the California Uniform Controlled Substances Act.

A. Respondent shall immediately surrender respondent's current DEA permit to the Drug Enforcement Administration for cancellation and reapply for a new DEA permit limited to those schedules authorized by this order.

B. The above prohibition against personal use or possession of controlled substances or dangerous drugs does not apply to medication lawfully prescribed to respondent for a bona fide illness or condition by another practitioner.

3. Abstention

Respondent shall abstain completely from the use of alcoholic beverages. Respondent shall immediately submit to biological fluid testing, at respondent's cost, upon the request of the division or its designee.

4. Psychiatric Evaluation

Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, and on a periodic basis thereafter as may be required by the division or its designee, respondent shall undergo a psychiatric evaluation by a division appointed psychiatrist who shall furnish a psychiatric report to the division or its designee.

If respondent is required by the division or its designee to undergo psychiatric treatment, respondent shall within 30 days of the requirement notice submit to the division for its prior approval the name and qualifications of a psychiatrist of respondent's choice. Upon approval of the treating psychiatrist, respondent shall undergo and continue psychiatric treatment until further notice from the division. Respondent shall have the treating psychiatrist submit quarterly status reports to the division.

5. Alcohol Rehabilitation Program

Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall submit to the division for its prior approval an alcohol rehabilitation program in which respondent shall participate at least weekly for at least 50 weeks of the calendar year for the duration of probation. In the quarterly reports to the division, respondent shall provide documentary evidence of continuing participation in this program.

6. Education Course

The division shall determine how many, if any, additional continuing education hours respondent shall fulfill. If such additional hours are so required as part of the conditions of probation, within 90 days of the effective date of this decision, and on an annual basis thereafter, respondent shall submit to the division for its prior approval an educational program or course related to general medicine or a field of specialization respondent shall engage in for each year of probation. This program shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education requirements for re-licensure. Following the completion of each course, the division or its designee may administer an examination to test respondent's knowledge of the course.

7. Obey All Laws

Respondent shall obey all federal, state and local laws, and all rules governing the practice of medicine in California.

8. Quarterly Reports

Respondent shall submit quarterly declarations under penalty of perjury on forms provided by the division, stating

whether there has been compliance with all the conditions of probation.

9. Surveillance Program

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

15 |

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Respondent shall comply with the division's probation surveillance program.

Interview with Medical Consultant

Respondent shall appear in person for interviews with the division's medical consultant upon request at various intervals and with reasonable notice.

Tolling for Out-of-State Practice or Residence 11.

In the event respondent should leave California to 12 reside or to practice outside the state, respondent must notify the division in writing of the dates of departure and return. Periods of residency or practice outside California will not apply to the reduction of this probationary period.

12. Completion of Probation

Upon successful completion of probation, respondent's certificate will be fully restored.

13. Violation of Probation

If respondent violates probation in any respect, the division, after giving respondent notice and the opportunity to be heard, may revoke probation and carry out the disciplinary order that was stayed. If an accusation or petition to revoke probation is filed against respondent during probation, the division shall have continuing jurisdiction until the matter is final, and the period of probation shall be extended until the matter is final.

1	GEORGE DEUKMELIAN, Attorney General
2	NANCY K. CHIU, Deputy Attorney General
3	DATED: 1-17-83 By Wat Coupled, comple
4	MANCY K. CHIU Deputy Attorney General
5	Attorneys for Complainant
6	DATED: 12/2/6)
7	BENNET OLAN, ESQ. Attorney for Respondent
8	I have read and discussed the above stipulation with my
9	counsel Bennet Olan. I fully understand the terms of the above
10	stipulation and hereby freely consent to and accept said
11	stipulation. /
12	DATED: 17 1 82
13	ROGER NEAL GOODLIN, M.D. Réspondent
14	DECISION AND ORDER
15	The prior decision revoking respondent's license is
16	hereby set aside. The above stipulation is adopted as the
17	decision of the Division of Medical Quality of the Board of
18	Medical Quality Assurance.
19	Further, respondent is ordered to fulfill 50 hours
20	of continuing education per year in addition to the continuing
21	education requirements for re-licensure, pursuant to probation
22	condition number 7 of the above stipulation.
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

This decision shall be effective on the 16th day of 1983. February IT IS SO ORDERED this ______17th day of _______ 1983. MILLER MEDEARIS, Secretary-Treasurer Division of Medical Quality Board of Medical Quality Assurance NKC:sl 03573110-LA82CV1189 S7, ROGER1-9

1	GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, Attorney General NANCY K. CHIU,				
2	Deputy Attorney General 3580 Wilshire Boulevard				
3	Los Angeles, California 90010				
4	Telephone: (213) 736-2000				
5	Attorneys for Complainant				
6					
7					
8	BEFORE THE				
9	DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE				
10	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
11	In the Matter of the Accusation) NO. D-2765 Against:				
12) FIRST AMENDED ACCUSATION				
13	ROGER NEAL GOODLIN, M.D.) Physician's and Surgeon's)				
14	Certificate No. A-32752,)				
15	Respondent.)				
16	COMES NOW Robert G. Rowland, complainant herein, who				
17	alleges as follows:				
	direges as follows.				
18	1. Complainant Robert G. Rowland is the Executive				
18 19					
	1. Complainant Robert G. Rowland is the Executive				
19	1. Complainant Robert G. Rowland is the Executive Director of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance of the State				
19 20	1. Complainant Robert G. Rowland is the Executive Director of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance of the State of California (hereinafter "board") and makes and files this				
19 20 21	1. Complainant Robert G. Rowland is the Executive Director of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance of the State of California (hereinafter "board") and makes and files this first amended accusation in his official capacity only.				
19 20 21 22	1. Complainant Robert G. Rowland is the Executive Director of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance of the State of California (hereinafter "board") and makes and files this first amended accusation in his official capacity only. 2. On or about August 7, 1978, the board issued				
19 20 21 22 23	1. Complainant Robert G. Rowland is the Executive Director of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance of the State of California (hereinafter "board") and makes and files this first amended accusation in his official capacity only. 2. On or about August 7, 1978, the board issued physician's and surgeon's certificate number A-32752 to				
19 20 21 22 23 24	1. Complainant Robert G. Rowland is the Executive Director of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance of the State of California (hereinafter "board") and makes and files this first amended accusation in his official capacity only. 2. On or about August 7, 1978, the board issued physician's and surgeon's certificate number A-32752 to respondent Roger Neal Goodlin, M.D. (hereinafter "respondent")				

27 force and effect.

- Section 2361 (new 2234) of the code provides that the division shall take action against any holder of a certificate who is guilty of unprofessional conduct.
- Section 2390 (now § 2239) of the code provides, 5• in part, that the use of alcoholic beverages to the extent, 13 or in such a manner as to be dangerous or injurious to the licensee or to any other person or to the public or to the extent that such use impairs the ability of such a person to conduct with safety to the public the practice of medicine with safety to the public, or the conviction of more than one 19 misdemeanor involving the use of alcoholic beverages or controlled substance, constitutes unprofessional conduct. $21 \parallel \text{Said}$ section further provides that the record of the conviction is conclusive evidence of such unprofessional conduct.

24

22

1

2

7

8

9

12

The Medical Practice Act (§§ 2000-20528.3 of the 25 Bus. & Prof. Code) was repealed by the Legislature and new sections were enacted effective January 1, 1981. Both the old section numbers and new section numbers are included in this accusation. The new section numbers are set forth in parentheses 27 |after the old section numbers.

6. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2361 (now § 2234) of the code in that respondent has been guilty of unprofessional conduct within the meaning of section 2390 (now § 2239) of the code in having used alcoholic beverages to the extent or in such a manner as to be dangerous to himself or another or to the public or respondent has been convicted or more than one misdemeanor involving the use of alcoholic beverages or controlled substance. The circumstances are as follows:

A. On or about December 9, 1980, in the vicinity of the Santa Monica shopping mall in Santa Monica, California, respondent was intoxicated while in a public street. As a result of said action, on or about February 18, 1981, in the Municipal Court of the Santa Monica Judicial District, County of Los Angeles, State of California, in a case entitled, "The People of the State of California vs. Roger Neal Goodlin," Case No. D58606, respondent pled guilty to and was convicted of violating section 647, subdivision (f), of the Penal Code (public intoxication).

- (1) As a result of said conviction, respondent was ordered to serve one day in the Los Angeles County Jail and one day's credit was allowed under section 2900.5 of the Penal Code for time in custody.
- B. On or about August 7, 1980, respondent was driving on a public road while under the influence of

alcohol. As a result of said act, on or about August 27, 1980, in the Municipal Court of the Los Angeles Judicial District, County of Los Angeles, in a case entitled, "The People of the State of California vs. Roger Neal Goodlin," Case No. V094823, respondent pled guilty to and was convicted of violating section 21658, subdivision (a), of the Vehicle Code (failure to drive within one lane) and section 22348, subdivision (a), of the Vehicle Code (speeding). Respondent was fined \$50 for each count.

C. On or about April 26, 1980, respondent was intoxicated and engaged in disorderly conduct at the Queen Mary Village in Long Beach, California.

As a result of said action, on or about August 4, 1980, in the Municipal Court of Long Beach Judicial District, County of Los Angeles, State of California, in a case entitled, "The People of the State of California vs. David Sherwood Dunard," case No. M162345, respondent pled guilty to and was convicted of violating section 415.1 of the Penal Code (disturbing the peace). As a result of said conviction, respondent was ordered to pay \$255 or serve 6 days in the Los Angeles County Jail.

(1) Respondent purported to be David Sherwood Dunard throughout said proceeding.

/

 7. Section 2391.5 (now § 2238) of the code provides, in part, that a violation of any federal statute, or rule or regulation or any of the statutes or rules or regulation of this state regulating dangerous drugs or controlled substances constitutes unprofessional conduct.

- 8. Quaalude is a brand name for methaqualone, a schedule II controlled substance under section 11056, subdivision (b)(6), of the Health and Safety Code and 21 C.F.R., § 1308.12, subdivision (e)(1), and a dangerous drug under section 4211, subdivision (a), of the code.
- 9. Section 4230 of the code provides, in part, that no person shall have in his possession any preparation included in subdivision (a) or (c) of section 2411.
- 10. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2361 (now § 2234) of the code in that respondent has engaged in unprofessional conduct within the meaning of section 2391.5 (now § 2238) of the code in having violated a law regulating dangerous drugs or controlled substances. The circumstances are as follows:

On or about December 9, 1980, respondent illegally possessed Quaalude.

WHEREFORE, complainant prays that the division hold a hearing on the matters alleged herein, and following said hearing issue a decision:

1. Suspending or revoking respondent's physician's and surgeon's certificate; and

5•

	1	
	2	d
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
	10	
	11	
	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
NKC:bc	25	
	26	
LA81ADU/U/	07	

Taking such other and further action as the 2. division deems appropriate.

> DATED: July 8, 1981

Executive Director, Board of Medical Quality Assurance State of California

Complainant

27

6/10/81